

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| To: | | WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) | |
| | | | |
| Applicant's or agent's file reference | | Date of mailing (day/month/year) 23.09.2004 FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below | |
| International application No. PCT/RU2004/000005 | International filing date (day/month/year) 12.01.2004 | Priority date (day/month/year) | |
| International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C25D11/02 | | | |
| Applicant NIKIFOROV, Aleksey Aleksandrovich | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: <div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; gap: 5px;"> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I Basis of the opinion</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. II Priority</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI Certain documents cited</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application</div> </div> | |
| 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. | |
| 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. | |

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Name and mailing address of the ISA/RU | Authorized officer |
| Facsimile No. | Telephone No. |

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/RU2004/000005

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/RU2004/000005

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis 1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---|-----|
| Novelty (N) | Claims | 1 | YES |
| | Claims | | NO |
| Inventive step (IS) | Claims | 1 | YES |
| | Claims | | NO |
| Industrial applicability (IA) | Claims | 1 | YES |
| | Claims | | NO |

2. Citations and explanations:

Reference is made to the following documents
cited in the search report:

D1: Novikov A.N. Remont detalei iz alyuminiya
i ego splavov. Orel, OGSKHA, 1997, pages 32, 33

D2: SU 1578236 A1

D4: RU 2124588 C1

D3: US 6197178 B1

D5: EP 1029952 A2

The prior art closest to the claimed method for
production by microarc oxidation of thick-layered,
highly adhesive protective coatings on parts made
of rectifying metals is the method which is
described in D1, and includes mounting the part in
electrolyte on a current-conducting holder coated
with insulating material, creating a working
voltage between the part and the electrolyte,
raising the voltage until a microarc discharge
occurs on the surface of the part.

The claimed method differs from the known
method in that the part holder is externally
coated on the air-electrolyte interface with an
electroinsulating material. Said distinctive
feature, which makes it possible to eliminate the

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/RU2004/000005

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

effect of the steam-gas phase i.e. avoid shunting the part and weakening the magnitude of the current through the part, creates conditions for further voltage growth and, therefore, rapid growth of the thickness of the coating, is not disclosed in D2-D4, and is not obvious.

Therefore, the set of claims meets the requirement of novelty and inventive step, and also industrial applicability.